Transcript to Adeline Green
Rough

MR. NYLAND: I just tried to finish listening to the tape of last week. But I didn't finish it entirely. I got to the place where Ruthy was explaining about coffee. Most of the tape was devoted, and by the way terribly noisy. Not only outside but also inside moving. Try not to do it ( ). You're still in a little quandry, should be actually. Where'd the radio go?

Answer: ( )

MR. NYLAND: Really? It's difficult to have everything your own way. You're not. Because sometimes if you want a tape. You may have to suffer towards the windows and sometimes close up the windows entirely so that you don't have the noise. And then you ask yourself, what is the use of the tape? And should we really suffer for that particular purpose? I would almost say it's up to you. But not entirely. There is an advantage for me to listen to a tape afterwards, usually when I'm not here. And also sometimes the questions that we do talk about may be helpful to other groups. So, since many other groups are in the same kind of situation as we are in talking about the beginnings of Work and the principles that are involved, and ordinary experiences of life. So, for that reason, if there is a tape available with a few questions and answers, it might be helpful to others and it might stimulatethem. So, we'll try it for a little while with the windows closed and see and hope that the bars will not allow too much traffic to go on Lexington Avenue. That is nonsense to have a road block of such.

Most of the time you talked about. Well you talked about Work. A great deal of the. Robert here today? Robert is not here? Huh. Julie?

Julie: Not here.

MR. NYLAND: No. The conversation was for a great deal between Mollie and Robert and a few of the others. Where is Mollie? Is Mollie here today?

Answer: Not yet.

MR. NYLAND: No. And we won't want to talk about Mollie because what I was going to say was addressed to her. So, let's talk. You know, when you come to a group like this, you are expected to do something besides just sitting down again and again you have to realize that you come for a definite reason and that you expect to get something. So that you also have to pay a little bit. By paying attention to what you want to hear, and to see that what you want to hear is really what you want. So naturally you will hear about other people asking questions and if you happen to sit and you, you're lucky. And then you become a little sponge just soaking up things without any particular credit to you. And as the word is really, you're sponging on someone else. And it's not right. Because whenever you come to a group there is a certain obligation on you. That you have to help maintain the group by means of questions and particularly your attitude and if it's dumb and sitting and not saying very much then we don't have groups. So again, it is up to you to continue if you wish these kind of groups to continue, you have to do it yourself. Not me. Now questions.

Jim Fosso: A couple of years ago I began the study of a painter, H_____Bosch. And I had a feeling there was something not in an aesthetic way, but he was trying to say something very definite through his work.

MR. NYLAND: Who knows him? Ah, everybody.

Jim: I tried to find out some things about the man himself. Because it seemed to be that he was - he was saying something that he was living. In other words, this was something that was very close to him. I believed at the time it related to some sort of mystical experience, or allusion to getting back to original Christianity. Uh, do you know anything about him?

MR. NYLAND: About his life?

Jim: Yes.

MR. NYLAND: I think he was a good painter.

Jim: I think so.

MR. NYLAND: At the same time, you know, out of the mouths of crazy people, you sometimes can hear the truth. I think he was quite definitely disturbed. And he was trying to find something and use his painting as an object in order to get rid of the something that bothered him. How much he actually reached. And I've never looked at this old pictures or the ones that he made in his youth if there was any particular kind of progress. I doubt it very much. I think he turned around all the time within the same kind of circle and didn't get anywhere. At least that's my impression. Not that they are not interesting. I think they are extremely and I think that it was as I say a disturbed man. And that he raised up many things in himself that had to come to the surface and painting was then the medium he had to use. I think as far as the man is concerned. I don't know anything about his life. But I think it would be interesting to really find out how he was when he didn't care. How he was, was he married ( )?

Jim: He was married to a wealthy woman. He lived in a castle outside a small town. He also belonged to a religious order called the Brothers of the common ( ). Something like that. They did - they gave the mask drums and it was proportedly an organization trying to uncover the roots of Christianity.

MR. NYLAND: But they never published anything. Did they?

Jim: No. I don't think so. There's some scanty records left over.

MR. NYLAND: Have you found anything, huh?

Jim: There's some scanty records left over but that's about it.

Tom Harris: There's a long book about that ( ) by Thomas Bosch. He offers this thesis that he belonged to a sect that could be atomized or something that he said...

MR. NYLAND: That he was what?

Tom: Atomized. The only records seem to be of that is in the inquisition. They met in a windmill just outside of the city.

(laughter)

MR. NYLAND: Maybe that has significance.

(laughter)

Jim F: I understand that...

MR. NYLAND: I think he is an interesting man. I think it is worthwhile to find out much more about him. But not as a painter. But as a man. How he was with his wife. If he had any children. How was he looked upon in the community where he happened to live. And the kind of friends he had. The kind of other influences. Was he to some extent just one pin pointed painter without anything else or was he much more all around. I think that would determine much more what the man put to use because if it is very specialized like many lines of work in certain ways if a person is like that and excludes all the other possibilities, he is not particularly harmonious and he is not a ( ) to himself so it makes it very difficult to talk to him and that of course without any doubt he rebells agains that what exists and then he tries to find in his life by joining his brotherhood, and so forth. Because you see there's so little known about him. So far, all you have is paintings. Do they appeal to you?

Jim F: In a strange way. Sometimes they bother me. I don't like them.

MR. NYLAND: Do they inspire you?

Jim F: They did at one point. They seemed to be something.

MR. NYLAND: To do differently?

Jim F.: They inspired me to Work.

MR. NYLAND: What was your idea? I don't want to paint like him. But I will paint it ( ).

Jim F: Yes, but uh, the idea of trying to say something. Painting as a means of communication.

MR. NYLAND: You don't need it for that. Because you have that yourself. Now, inspiration is really that he helps you, as an example of the either positive or negative kind, to overcome difficulties which might be in your way or certain things that might lead you astray. I think it's quite possible for a person like that to have that kind of an influence. Partly it may be that you say, but he wanted to say something he doesn't say it as far as I know but I can say it then you say it, you see. And it may also create the impression that here was a man wanting to work against all kind of difficulties and odds and comparing it to your own life that you have the same kind of experience and then you say, but he overcame it because he painted. So, I will paint. There may be different motivations for it, naturally.

How far such an influence goes if it goes further than the first week, I don't know. You see, I think it can count all of a sudden and there you are, and then when your own energy has run out, then maybe Mr. Bosch cannot help you. If you take a man like Van Gogh who repeatedly was up against it, definitely tried to search for a particular place or an outlet, or some way of expressing himself against all kind of odds in different conditions of life. But it's already a little bit of a mark against him when he happened to be married to a wealthy woman. In general because then he didn't have the care of having to make a living. Most likely. And in all probability, that he could let himself go the way he wanted to go and then most likely, he baca me very uncontrolled. You see what I mean. If it is worthwhile to find out more about the man before you really can judge him. And it is not that a person like that should be like Michaelangelo, Leonardo DaVinci, a kind of an expert in all the different directions. Although the more harmonious a man is the more he will be able to equipp himself and adapt himself to different conditions and for me, value of a man is much more in that direction, ( ) happen to become an expert in any one direction.

Question #1: Would you consider Van Gogh a harmonious man?

MR. NYLAND: No. Not at all. I think he was tremendously disturbed.

#1: Does that discount the value of his work?

MR. NYLAND: No. Not at all. You see, the value of the work is again like four different kinds, if you compare them, the interest of a man in any one direction of his so-called three centers and also what is also called the fourth way. I think that the three centers like a saint or like a fakir or a yogi when it is mainly intellectual only, give a certain section of a man as a development in order to reach something that for them is higher and with which they can have contact and then for themselves get satisfaction in their life. But as far as a man is concerned, when he is made up of three possibilities, and he developes only one, then I think he misses the boat in being a man. He may reach God or he may reach a mystical way of communion but it is not as a man in my opinion should be on Earth. So, the fact that he was born on Earth and had so-called three centers it had a meaning for him. And by trying to develope only one, one becomes a little bit lopsided and although it may be more convenient for him because he has talents in that direction, he goes away from becoming a man on Earth and fulfilling his functions as a man. It depends entirely how you define it. Whether you can say, well he's a marvelous man because he can paint and of course that kind of a definition of a man is not the way I look at a man when I define it as something that should be harmonious and in equilibrium.

#1: Would you say that then there is a direct relationship between the degree to which a man can integrate his separate parts and the quality of the work he can produce?

MR. NYLAND: I think what is needed is for anyone to use the talents that he has in any one particular direction and at the same time try to develope where he has no talent in order to come to, you might say, to a state, in which what he has as representative

of man being three cantered, the possibility of in combining all three that it might produce a harmonious sound of his life.

But you see this is filled with ordinary definitions that everybody can disagree with and here each person can have his own. Because what do I understand by a certain mixture of three centers producing a sound which is harmonious? In the first place, what is there of centers? In the second place, what is the deficiency in the centers compared to another one? In the third place, when I say it produces a sound, is it cacaphonical, or is it harmonious? And was ( ) my sense idea of harmonious. So, I would have to define it much more than that. I would have to say a man if he is a man. And I call him now all around man. A man who is able in any kind of circumstances to remain what a man should be and to know what to do and not to lose himself and to control sufficiently so that to be able to give in whatever direction it is required exactly that what is needed for the solution of that kind of problem existing in such a condition.

So you see, you come back to the point, what is this kind of a man and how would you describe him? Because simply saying harmonious, doesn't mean very much. It is without any question he has to give off a sound. He has to be a representation of something that is life in him and then becomes noticed in some way or other. But again we have to define what is this particular sound for. Is it for the glory of God? Is it for his own self satisfaction? Or is it for the influence on the rest of men. And I say the more harmonious a man can be the more the different directions could become. So it should not be one and not the other. But he should try to be all around altering the form of his expressions. And that what he wishes to express of himself, how can it be of any particular value to the outside world? Unless they happen to become interested in him as a person and then again the question is what will he say? The reference to that what can help humanity or mankind as a whole or will it be in praise of the Lord who has created him? You can never leave out any particular side of a

man whenever you start to talk or ( ). Because whenever there is a loop hole or a little bit of something that is like it, it is exactly that that spoils the totality of a ( ). You can have harmonious sounds all along like a ( ) and all of a sudden there is a false note. It disturbs you at that time because it creates in a person who plays or a person who listens something of a mood. And when that is disturbed by means of a cacaphonical note, then of course a person becomes a little upset, and perhaps loses confidence in the expression of that kind of a form of art.

Then again you see, what is harmony? Is harmony the question for the man himself to be at peace within him? It does not mean that he is not influenced by outside conditions. It does not mean that perhaps he may be dead. But if he is very much alive, at the time when he is influenced by any kind of condition that he knows how to take it without losing himself. So, if a man has an aim that regardless of whatever the conditions are under which he happens to live, and whatever influences him, that he continues to have that aim provided he knows that that aim has a very definite purpose for existing in himself. And the harmony will be that at any one time being faced with difficult problems of life, he will never lose that what he really is, and remains undisturbed. So, regardless of whatever Van Gogh tried to do, he was never disturbed in his inner life. Because he had an aim and his outer life caused all kind of trouble but he was not sufficiently trong to know that that what he was doing was the right thing for him. There were two reasons: one, he depended on hisbrother, and the other he committed suicide. And that simply means, when you look at the totality of a life, it is desirable ( ) producing many things that are, of let's call it, of excellent value and surely has in it an enormous amount of life and life giving force and that one can be influenced by looking at it and getting inspired. And still as a life, he is not living up to that what I consider harmonious. You understand what I mean?

#1: Yes I do, but what could he have done?

MR. NYLAND: I don't know. As he was he couldn't have done anything else.

#1: In otherwords, there was no hope for him.

MR. NYLAND: ( ) There was hope because if that whatever he persued I think to some extent he freed himself from certain bondages of life. Because he maintained himself in the midst of all kind of different conditions. Also without being disturbed by them. But that what disturbed him within himself, was his ability to extract. You see a person can be affected by many things in his life but he knows he has an aim and also that he has a purpose for his life. He understands the meaning of his life. And still he may fail in the ability to manifest it. It's a separate thing. A person can be boiling inside and know very well that there is something that has to be expressed. And he may not have the means of expressing it. The acquisition of that kind of facility particularly psychologically is extremely difficult to acquire. Now one has to go many times through a long period, exercises of a certain kind for the application or the desire to want to overcome the difficulties that one faces. And I'm not talking about physical dexterity. I'm talking about the kind of conditions in which the mood predominates and then because of the mood, certain other channels have closed. If I'm constantly involved in my thoughts and disturbed because I cannot solve certain problems either in my ordinary life or in relation towards my God, then I'm not capable of producing something that remains harmonious. But I can touch it. And I can throw it out. Like an explosion. And then you might almost say, hope for the best. And in any even, if I do I will be empty. And in that way, that kind of a purging, I may have the possibility of creating something new. But you see so difficult it is to judge a person. Is it because of a little bit of manifestation that we know? And his real life, what does one know? Theo, his brother probably knew more than anyone else. But I'm sure his son doesn't. And anyone, like Stone writing about The Lust for Life cannot get it. But if you read from Gogh's own hand in the way he had written it, in Dutch and in French, as a taste, which unfortunately is not entirely in the

translation. But you see it happens to be fortunate because I can read Dutch and I can read French. And there are three volumes. It's marvelous because then you get the picture of the man. And still it is not the man. The man is his relation to his own conscience. And about that, that is his private life. And probably no body knows. Probably nobody. Not even the woman he lives with or whoever he was married to.

You see what I mean. It's too extremely difficult to have any judgement when we only have just a little bit of fragments about a person's expression. And what really, what is he? What was he? When he got up in the morning. It's interesting to think about it. How was Bethoven when he got up in the morning? Yet I don't know if it was a long sleep or not. Did it take him a long time before he woke up, so-called? Was he nasty, and obnoxious? Couldn't he talk before he had coffee. You see, there are side-lights every once in a while from someone who happens to be in the neighborhood. Like Ben Jonson, you know. Giving an accurate description, blow by blow account of what a person has been doing, so on. And even that, it's outside. Who cares what really goes on inside. Who wants to have this, I call it psychological hair down. They don't. There's no interest because they are contained within themselves and only at times when it is too much, it becomes an explosion. And then when it's an explosion and it is emotionally tinted, it's probably is not the right time, in the right way.

Yah.

( ): It seems to me more with an artist, than any other man, they should be able to see in his work what he was like as a man. And because Bosch....

Mr. NYLAND: Not necessarily, because you ( ) to art because it's a little bit closer to what we see and what's usually is expressed. I think a religious man has exactly the same kind of an attitude but we don't see it, because he doesn't express it in that kind of a form. And if you take scientific people whose intellect is more let's say interesting for them at least and their emotions, in a general way, a person who's a real inventor, a real research man, a man who wants to go down to the core of why things

are that way, mathematical or logically, whatever it may be, or a philosopher who tries to find a meaning of things in whatever people have lived or whatever they've said whatever their experience. And to judge that from that standpoint, including of course what other people have done before, anthropologically included in all of that kind of attitude. What is there such people have toward it, exactly the same attitude as an artist has towards the expression by means of freedom. And whenever a philosopher or a scientist, creates, he creates a system, a philosophical system, or an insight in how certain things must connect and link together and then will produce this and that and maybe articles that are of commercial use for the benefit of mankind, so forth. All of that for a good scientist whose really a scientist. He has exactly the same problems to face as an artist has to face. So don't think that you can judge neither a scientist or philosopher or religious man, or an artist by their expressions to the outside world.

I think a man is made up really of four different facets of which the fourth one doesn't become very much known, although in the case of an artist it does become known. It is a sociological influence of that what are the art productions which then, being presented to the rest of the world, can have certain effects. I call it sociological, but sociologically there are many different activities where one reaches people one never meets. That is the criterion of sociological because I amy have an influence on a lot of people who never have known me, only have seen my work. Assuming for a moment that I am interested in publicity and that I write a book, or that certain things I now produce and they are in a gallery, or that a few people come and look at the fountain that I've created somwhere on Fifth Avenue. Whatever it may be - of course, by means of that I influence people who look at it and they become either influenced one way or another, and it might create even in them, like Bosch, certain desires to do something or even to kill him. But that is only one particular facet of a man. There are three others, and they're not sharply defined - one flows over into another but the one is quite definitely the relation to his conscience, and his God. And it's a private relationship

about which he doesn't talk. He doesn't want to. It doesn't belong there. And even when he prays to his God, he may not be entirely truthful because he doesn't know how God is going to look at him. But maybe he asks, or at least he establishes a relationship of a very high calibre and usually emotional. Then of course the second is ordinary personal relationships between people who have relations where they care for each other and whatever it may be, family or friends or whatever and the third, naturally is the professional. It is often, but you see, in all these three, you know what you're talking to and who with. And you know your God. You may not have seen him but it is a reality for you because your, because you talk to him. Personally of course it's obvious. Professionally, it's obvious. Sociologically it is not. You see what I mean. These arefour different sections of one.

( ): But none of this is in his work? And could be read by another man?

MR. NYLAND: Sometimes it could be. If a man really understands how to read. And you're quite right. A person who listen to Bethoven will not have the same reactions you or I or anyone else. It depends on how you are. To what extent you're open to that what Bethovan was expressing. If I'm predjudiced, I will be a terrible critic. I would not be able to see what someone else is trying to say because he is not saying it the way I want to say it. And therefore I say he's no good. Who are the critics who talk about artists? What are they? A little bit of a whipper snappers as a profession. Given a review of a book, it is written by someone who has studied for thirty or forty years on that one subject and it is reviewed in the Saturday Review. Good or bad and all that. We know enough about it kind of publicity for this and that and so forth. Utter nonscense. But we're completely crazy. And you know it. A musician, he's got to perform. What will he perform? He has to show the public that he knows Bach, in and out, Chopin, Bethovan, Stravinsky. I was almost going to say Rembrandt. And his program has to contain practically everything and then the critics will write about how well he did Chopin. How well he was Schuman, and this and that and so forth. And honest, what

do they know? And what does the man who, is he able.

I talked once about a man in Europe who was really Bethoven. His name was Ramon. And whenever he played, he played nothing else but Bethoven and after twenty years, he started to look like him and when he came on the platform it was nothing. All the announcements was Ramon. Everybody knew what it was. And he was absolutely -A- number one better than ( ). He was Ramon, he was Bethoven and there he sat, well to some extent maybe Bethoven reincarnated into Ramon. I don't know. But in any event, this is the requirement in order to study a man. To become such a part of Bethoven. So that then when one plays, it is as if Bethoven was playing. But you see it's an impossibility. It only happens once in a while. Otherwise we have to do well what Bethoven or any other musician indicates in the music. When it doesn't leave cresendo and it has to be dimenduendo or it has to be respendo and so forth or cadence or whatever. One is indicating there by the notes how you should play. Do they know, the result is interpretation of certain things so that one says he plays Chopin very well.

It's silly. It's nonsensical and it's absolutely rediculous to any to conduct. If it's just an interpreter, no more. Unfortunately with music, it happens to be that that is the case. With painting fortunately when it's a copy, it's still called a copy.

( ): Well, then I don't know if it's necessary to say this, but according to what you've been saying could be that the man who will explain Heronomous Bosch to us will be a man who could read his painting.

MR. NYLAND: Oh yes.

( ): Because we don't know nothing else about him....

MR. NYLAND: That's right. That is right. So we always have to agree with the last speaker. Of course it's quite possible. I'm not saying anything against the possiblity only I say occasionally, the probablity of existence is very small. It requires really

the study of one man to study another man.

( ): ( ).

MR. NYLAND: And then it is still problematical if one can write and express it, really see what the man is. For instance, the different varieties of kinds of music that Bach has written and produced it. They're not all the same and it's not at all what the function is. Several are not at all. And for instance there is the question of saying goodbye to his friends, a piece of music that perhaps you don't know about it. It is as light as a feather and is a s beautiful and such lovely melody and absolutely joyful. And you compare that with the St. Mathew Passion and still it's the same man. And it's a man with a good house-householder, a father, family, lovely organ; living in Eisiner, nice surrounding and to expect that of a man. But he was young at that time and something came up. Now, if one wants to describe Bach. Of course you have to include that if you want to. And it may be afterwards when he grew older that he became a different kind of a man and then produced chorales, fugues, without stopping.

Did Mollie come?

( ): No

MR. NYLAND: I seem to be quite anxious for her. Other questions.

( ): Robert came.

MR. NYLAND: Robert ( ).

Yah.

( ): I came across something in ALL AND EVERYTHING a couple of weeks ago which I'd like to hear something about if possible. This is described as among the direct commandments of our All Embracing Endlessness and the commandment is " always guard against such perceptions as may soil the purity of your brains."

MR. NYLAND: Well, what will we say about that? I think it's very clear, isn't it?

( ): I don't know how far it goes.

MR. NYLAND: Well, that's true. You have to settle that for yourself. When is a paper

white? When it is still a little gray is it still white? Off white we call it. Test a little. When it has a certain shadow on it and it is in the dark corner, is it still white? It depends on, in that case, on your taste or perhaps on your eye sight. Or maybe on that what you are associated with and what you like. What is that? So when it comes to the question of a purity of brain, what thoughts will you allow? What kind of thoughts you consider will not depurify your brain? Then the question comes up, what is the brain for. And then of course you can go all over the place because I say my brain is sufficient for me to sit up and take notice and someone else says my brain has to be able to understand the riddles of the universe. And the other says, my brain is quite enough for being a good announcer on T.V. or radio. And what is pure for these different people? And you don't get anywhere because there is no average. There is no specific something that will tell you what the brain should be. Some of us say a brain is the best when it is not used because then it is pure. And others ~~say~~ would say it is necessary to use it, otherwise it gets rusty. So, again, how much use is needed to keep a brain active? How much do I receive in my brain without being able to stop it? This of course depends on the conditions I live in and also the kind of education I have. One has ~~to~~ a tremendous amount that perhaps, at the present time looking at it, I could consider soiling my brain by having an awful lot of extraneous knowledge that is no use to me and nevertheless it was put in there because I happen to go through an examination where it was required. And at most maybe you can say, well, at least it gave me facility of thinking. And then again, what part of the brain is one talking about? Because there are different parts Formulatory, pondering, brain close to the thalmus, the feeling center, that what is really pure, if it is clear in the formulation. It may not be clear at all in the weighing part. So you see, it is a very general remark. But it has to be answered generally. Get out of the different effect influences on me which ~~perhaps~~ are translated into my brain into something which I perhaps will call knowledge. That therefore I do not wish too much of that knowledge to fill it up with useless material. Then I will have a

criterian because I will know what is useless for me. And when I come to the conclusion that I have no use for such kind of an information and nevertheless it is there, or I'm being fed on it, I then will have a right to say, it is not pure for my brain. Or rather, if I let it go in, it soils it. So you see, I link it up then with the use that I have for my own brain and becomes of course extremely personal. And it cannot be compared to what some one else considers right or soiling for their brain. I have to solve the question for myself only. When I solve it, then I will know that certain things I will expose myself to and other things, I will simply close my brain. How far does one want to go in this particular purification process? Because there's already an awful lot that is soiled and a lot of sawdust is in it that is in the way. And to some extent it is too heavy to carry. And when it is there, it prevents the brain from adding more of real knowledge. And what is real knowledge for me? That is useful to me? Again the definition what is use, on Earth or use for me to grow, or use for me to reach God. You see there are three different things. One has to do with an existence on Earth in the best way I can. The second is the preparation for the possibility of a journey, and the third is the contact with that what I consider higher than I am. And for all three you have to have different kind of brains. When Gurdjieff talks about that, he means that there are certain possibilities for the brain which unfortunately has been soiled and as he many times has said, like a white piece of paper it has been scribbled on by practically everyone. That at the present time, the brain the way it is, needs a purification process. But who is there to administer it? And what is there still as a possibility in one's brain that actually could start to function in a pure way? And then Gurdjieff tells us to find out in what way can we at the present time start with solving that problem and to what extent is it possible to find certain sections in the brain that are still able to remain pure or that we feed it with material that is more useful than we usually have in ordinary life. Well, all of this, you know, it looks very complicated because you can go almost any direction from such a statement and one has to define a very definite aim and of course if one

says I'm the master of my brain and I have to guide it entirely, then I will select that what is the kind of food that I think ought to be allowed me and that what should not be allowed. So of course I start selecting of how to use my brain. In the first selection of my brain, is that when I become interested in life as a whole believing that it is necessary for me to grow as a man. That then my brain has to become a servant for that particular purpose. And whatever the thoughts are now that take place in another part of my brain, thinking about the potentialities that I have, or that what should be my brain in it's pure form, then I again have this interchange between two parts and two sectionsof my brain. One thinking about what the other should do. The difficulty is again, to select that part of the brain that can remain unspoiled regardless of what happens to the other parts of the brain. And then we are back again at the problem of how to Work. You understand what I mean?

( ): Yes, I....

MR. NYLAND: It is much more complicated than just a simple statement.

( ): I think I was referring in a way to the idea of being a man in the world and sometimes....

MR. NYLAND: Again, who is a man in what world?

((((( ): As opposed to withdrawing from the world.

MR. NYLAND: Yah, of course it's nonsense. That can only be a temporary affair. At least it's a withdraw. I mean initially. After a little while, you feel that you ought to have company. But if you have something to do, like writing a book, you can sit in an ivory tower. It's very nice. And if you want to exclude yourself from the rest of the world, you can become ( ) and live in a ( ). Again we're back again to the same problem we had a little while ago, what's the purpose of man's life on Earth. So the withdrawl in my opinion is the opposite from where he is really. In the first place, it is not the proper purpose of man. In the second place, by doing it I reduce the activity of my brain. I can exclude all kind of influences on me and then beoome

holy. But it doesn't mean that I'm a man.

( ): So it seems to me then, by not withdrawing, but going further into the world it's inevitable that one's brain will come in contact with more and more....

MR. NYLAND: Sure.

( ): soiling influence.

MR. NYLAND: Of course. And the more and more and more old you grow the more you'll be able to close the doors to that what you don't want to have come in. Radio, is it good for children to listen to it. T.V., is it good for them. As a father and mother can you tell them not to see it.? Can you actually go so far not to have a T.V. in your house? Not to have a radio turned on unless necessary for the weather? Books. tenacious literature, erotic. Do you let them ly around or do you keep them in a drawer with a key? For yourself, the interest, interest in Fate magazine. Are you ashamed if someone sees you reading a detective story?

Side Two:

All AND EVERYTHING under your arm. That you actually dare to say that your brain is interested, Not only your heart interested in what is God. Or that you have a certain belief in your brain. Hoping that there is a possibility for further growth. And that at times when there is an arguement that you can stand up for it and say this is what my brain wishes. Naturally when one lives, and when you live in a complicated world and we're so far removed from what it used to be, as aborigines or a very primative life or anthropological conditions that cannot be compared to any so-called progress that there is now. Naturally we are affected by it. You can't get rid of it. You can't even get into an elevator without Musak music and all the nonsensical prattle that goes on in the restaurant where you have to sit close because they want to have an extra couple of bars. And you overhear conversations of someone else that of course is of no interest. And falling overboard in curiousity and the funny papers. Whatever it is. You know if I don't want certain thing, I close the door. If I don't want a friend, and I

see it coming up the sidewalk, I tell the people in the house that I'm not home. If I don't want to answer the telephone, I get an answering service saying that I'm busy. If I want to selct friends, I will allow them, as long as they remain friends. As soon as they tell me what's wrong with me, then no more friends.

But all the time select. It's idiotic to think that it is necessary, that I have to be exposed to all kind of things that happen to be. There is a point at which I make a distinction between that what I want and what I don't want. It's idiotic to say that I happen to be spoiled. Of course I was spoiled as long as I was completely unconscious or I had to do something that someone else tells me. Or I have to conform because I happen to live in Rome and to do as the Romans. And I have to have a degree and I have to go to college or university and they force me to get certain points in order to have a degree afterwards so that with that I can teach or whatever. Lots of times I have to sit and listen to someone who comes and tells me this and that, and I already know before they open their mouth. And still I will allow many times certain things to influence me because I know I can digest it. So it's not a question of soiling. It's a question of what do I take and how do I digest whatever comes in and to what extent am I willing to spend my time in all kind of nonsensical directions where my energy goes and at the end of the day I'm tired.

But you see it becomes much more of a difficult problem because then it is the damage to not only your brain but to the totality of all kind ofenergies in you, if you wish to become a man. How do you become a man? By trying to control certain things so that they don't go in the wrong direction. Or that afterwards you are either shamed or sorry that it has been spent in that.

. Don't consider it too much. Just consider your ordinary life. And do not do anything at all. And if you just sit and you look with your eyes. And your brain receives impressions of the books that you're supposed to have read. Or that the thoughts that go on in your mind as you sit quietly. Thoughts of jealousy most likely,

or comparing, or criticism, or something that you feel that your're entitled to it, you haven't got. And all the different things that you now occupy your brain with. And you allow it. How we are stupid fools to live even in the city. And to have noises like this from across the street when we could sit under a nice little park ( )read a book. But we can't professionally do better until you retire and then of course you have no more sex.

So, what is this question of brain developement. You see keep it pure. Yes. How will you get it? By being able to direct whatever you wish and not want to let enter that what you don't wish. And for that you hve to have a certain measure, what is right for you. What do you know about yourself? What is really right? How little do you know about your psychological development of allowing certain thiggs, books that you say, oh yes, I want to read, because it is of interest. Because I want to know what I shouldn't read. And then you go on a committee against the nation's literature in order to have a chance to read it. Stupidity and many times bringing some other conditon outide and so forth, to your own state of that what you allow for yourself to be and you submit to it without saying anything about it. And you condone it, because you don't oppose it. And who has the strength? Not to be like the Joneses. It is really the trouble that there is not enough strength in us to stand up for your own convictions and to really to fight for it and to live in a world which perhaps can criticize you and to be strong enough to stand that criticism and to say, but I know what I wish and usually you don't know so of course you become flexible.

That's a question with your brain. It's a question with your energy. It's a question with your life. How to spend your time. What is allowed? What you want to take and not take? What you can take? What you're influenced by, unknowing, in ignorance? All the different things, of course, as a growing person you have to consider it. How to use and utilize the best and usually you don't even know where to go, because there are so many conflicting ideas and suggestions and little problems which tell you what to

do about nothing and to live in accordance with certain morality and usually it ends up that you have to find it out for yourself. And the hard way and you burn your fingers and probably you do some damage to yourself. Because you don't know, this ignorance. That is why it should be taught early. And that is why people who think they know, even if they don't, at least they have an intention of being honest about it. Never mind that they don't know exactly what is what in your case. You can take it or leave it, but at least, it can stimulate you, to give value to that what really is in you, as yourself that you know is of value. And even if it is confusing it doesn't matter how confusing, it is. It is alive. Quite a different thing from being dead. And you don't want to die. You don't as yet. And don't allow yourself to die too prematurely.

Now other questions, what is there alive in you? What do you wish? What do you want out of life? It is really that question. What do you expect? What is your hope? What is really your belief? Because if it's a belief, it ought to be a possibility that it can be for you. Next year. This whole year. What are you going to do? Are you making plans already for the next year, 1968? What will it be, a year from now? Where will you be? What will you have accomplished? What will you have done regarding Work? Possible development of your inner life.

Yes.

Q : I - I'm wondering. You started talking about art. I remembered an attitude that I had in art school and I knew that there was something of value in myself and a long with that, I didn't care. I had an attitude that I didn't care what happened. In my ordinary life, I didn't care. And I wondered how that is this one little area that I could love of myself, that one little part that I could....

MR. NYLAND: Trial and error, ( ) depending entirely how much you can afford. If you marry a rich widow, with a castle you could pursue your art without worrying too much about your ordinary affairs of life. But usually if I want to pursue art for the sake of art, I will know for myself that I can expect that and I will want to do it, and

that is really the thing that gives me satisfaction. Two weeks later I'm already up against the difficulty of how to get some ( ) Because in the mean time, my art is not sufficiently expressive to be acceptable by the public so that I can live on it.

( ): That's right.

MR. NYLAND: Yes. So it is very good. So then I look for a patron - a 'patron' really, a patron saint, maybe. Someone who's going to help me and give me fifty dollars a week so that I can continue to pain t. But there are not many. And very seldom there are really such angels that are giving money away without any strings attached.

( ): Well, what do you think about this then that....

MR. NYLAND: One has to remain practical, that's what I think.

( ): Say someone knows that they have, something to give as far as art is concerned?

MR. NYLAND: It is still problematical.

( ): And they believe in that little part of themselves.

MR. NYLAND: They believe, yes, they hope. They hope. It may be a hallucination of their part, ah. Maybe it turns out to be reality, but I'm not considering that. They have an idea that they have something to communicate to the rest of the world.

( ): Maybe not. Maybe just their own experience...

MR. NYLAND: Ok who,

( ): standing in front of a canvas and painting.

MR. NYLAND: Who wants it. Who wants it?

( ): is ah...

MR. NYLAND: It is a self expression satisfaction of their own. It is not a very proper way of spending one's life. You see, I don't think it is right to be selfish. I think to some extent it's justified in order to find yourself. Really to try to find out if you can in that manner, what you are and more or less, not fool yourself. And I think for a little while it's quite alright, as long as you don't take anything away from someone

else that should by rights go to that person. So instead of remaining just a little bit xdtx selfish, I become more and more selfish by excluding other people who perhaps may need me or to whom I have an obligation.

( ): Well, in the same way someone would spend time with art and others would call it selfish, this same thing about Work, I mean to Work on yourself is also for your, is also selfish.

MR. NYLAND: Yes, the difficulty is however, art, the difference with Work on yourself is parallel to your ordinary work.

( ): That's right.

MR. NYLAND: But if you spend your time on art, you do it at the expense of something else that you don't do. It's a tremendousdifference. It's exactly the necessity...

( ): Rxxxxxxxx For art...

MR. NYLAND: For art is for everybody.

( ): Well, they, they...

MR. NYLAND: Supposing I'm a chemist and I'm interested in discovering something. Naturally I spend the time in a laboratory. I sit there and think and pour this and that, empty into the void, sulphuric acid. Whatever it may be. And sometimes maybe I forget even to sleep and them ( )or it doesn't ( ) because I don't need it. It's all the time that way, in ordinary life. And I cannot do thousand things at the same time. A few things I can do more or less, simultaneously, but it's not really serious. As far as Work on oneself is concerned, it's absolutely not selfishh because I don'ttake anything away from anyone.

( ): Actually you make something more of yourself.

MR. NYLAND: Yah, it is only my own...

( ): or...

MR. NYLAND: And I utilize what otherwise I don't utilize. And even that what is the energy of someone else ( ) in the gutter, I can pick it up in order to Work on myself.

So I'm not interfering with anything. And it's not that I'm altruistic. And it doesn't mean that if when I work on myself, I should later on utilize it in some form or other and then perhaps present it or even use it in order to help other people.

( ): What do you think the purpose of an artist is?

MR. NYLAND: To live and to use his art as something he wishes to express, by means of which he gives and indication that he is alive. And dependent on that what he wishes to express. On that will depend the level of his being. If he wishes to express his, himself, and assumes that it is worthwhile for other people to see it, his level of being is very low. But if he expresses that what is the reality of his life, in connection with that what may have created him as coming as direction from God, his expression becomes very high. And of his level of being, of course ( ).

( ): So the inner life of a painter, say like Van Gogh, one could looking at his painting see that...

MR. NYLAND: I think so. There is no doubt that he tried to find it/ This we also know from some of his letters what was his aim. His aim of his life. To find what is really beyond all activity. What was really the reason for himself even as an artist. To have this kind of a talent and to use it. Not for self expression. Then, whenever it was expressed, he was not satisfied with that. He constantly wanted something else and reapeated time and time again the same kind of a thing in order to bring up the ( ).

MR. NYLAND: Oh, the

( ): Oh, the difference between self expression and looking for the truth and ( ) in the expression.

MR. NYLAND: I can put in an expression any kind of a manifestation. I can put the truth in. As far as I'm concerned, it is free for me. Real truth exists without my expression. But if I allow myself to become a channel to give the truth, then it is not me, but it is the truth that is expressed. I try to get out of the expression as much as I can, anything that belongs to me. Anything that belongs to habit. Or any kind of pride. The emphasis in that kind of a religious way of expressing art is simply to glorify God and not be and that I accept to be able, you might almost say, to be chosen as such a channel and that the real reason for my life is life as a whole, not the little part that I happen to accept. The emphasis of a person is his Magnetic Center, only because that is unchanged. All the rest of his so-called character manifestations he could change. The more changes the less that is eternal.

Logically there is a place for art. There is a place for everything in his life. There's a place on Earth for everything we do. There's a place for human beings to behave the way they do. And they have to. And out of the difficulty they happen to live because Earth creates difficulties of living. Nature is cruel like Hell. And sometimes you get in contact with it, we are destroyed. Of course we don't want it because we have self preservation. There is nothinh against anyone wishing to express himself in any direction including art. Why not? Is that just a form of life that can be used.

( ): When you look at someone changing --you're open to their music what, how can it help you? I mean I know that their world is at your advantage of living in that world,

MR. NYLAND: An artist when he wishes to produce or create is in a certain state, in which he has a force that is sufficiently then to use this force for the creation of something that represents for him, the highest that he is capable of, of perceiving, you see? So the creation of the product, simply means that he selects a form, suitable to that what the content should be. And he tries to make the content as pure as he is able in his life to understand and to be able and he wants to do it as ( )

so that what he creates becomes a representation of what he perhaps in his own conscience tries to conceive of as a possibility of God or religiously of a different kind of definite feeling. This particular process from creation to the creator, this art to the -- of the creation -- from that what the creator to the creation is exactly the same but reversed. When someone is under the influence of becoming acquainted with the creation and so then has within himself possibility of being affected, the process is exactly the same , but it starts now with creation and goes back to that. Ultimately it is possible that a man who perceives a creation, a work of art starts to get to the same kind of a state as a creator. That would be a most ideal case. Usually it will not be like this because that what is the audience or the people who look at it are not like the artist. So in most cases it ( ) because that what they are will be partly in the way and partly not open enough to whatever is even meant by them, by the creation. But it can happen, like I said in the case of Ramon and Bethoven , it did happen. But it's very seldom. Sof of course, I know in any case of art, from art's standpoint, whatever I say exists or ought to be that then I say I like it or I don't like it in accordance with my own understanding. But if it can be, and this of course is a way of looking at objective art. If there is a definate purpose in the mind of an artist, that he wants to create a definite effect on certain people that then his objective art would be in the employ of his means of his ability, dexterity, finally the product that he creates which then in turn when it is being presented to mankind will create condition that he believes is needed. For instance, if I build a church I hope to make such a church will be because of proportions, because of space arrangement, maybe coloring, maybe colored windows, maybe whatever it is, that anyone entering into that church will become, what? Holy. Sacred and worships God or recognizes within himself what is really his value as a realization of a ( ) as human being alive and always in relation to his possible spiritual development. You might say that would be the purpose of the creation of a cathedral. And so it is with any kind of an

artistic production. And it is really that what one says for the benefit of mankind when it is something that belongs to mankind as a whole, like let's say ( ) or penicillan. So it ought to be available to everybody because it was a result of the creation of a man living in this kind of surrounding which surely affected him and he being what he is. But what do we do? We commercialize it. Even before it's on the market, it's already patented, and all the rest. It's too bad. Such things and every once in a while you see it is given to humanity. And the poor man of course, the inventor he hopes he can continue to live because he was ( ) and in many cases yes, he was not living. You see what I mean. Art has a very definite place. But so has all activity. And the gradation of the kinds of activities of where applied one's energy should be spent. That is a question to be decided by any person who becomes responsible. And by accepting the responsibility of one's life, one also accepts the responsibility how to utilize the energy that is available.

( ): If an artist can look at something, take out and look at, take the essence of what he is looking at, is that an aim of in art?

MR, NYLAND: The aim is for the artist always to give the best he can. It depends what he calls his best. It may be tinted in color by his own selfishness. It may be tinted by the wish to sell it and comercialism. It may be tinted by the necessity of having some kind of a money as a return so he can feed his children. Any kind of a thing can go in and it's up to the artist what he wants to do. If his aim is so high, that he says I know it won't sell, but I do this for the Glory of God, that is a way of living. And there is no criticism about it. You can say he's a fool. But he's not. You say one remains practical, because the legs and the feet are still on the ground.

( ): It's interesting - having this conversation like this. Because it brought into a certain point in myself that life is considered to be free ( ) very experience.

MR. NYLAND: That's right and the more you see that that form of art or that direction that one wants to go that there should be not be any reason to apply at the same time the

possiblity of being awake. The difficulty of course is when I beocome involved in what I want to do in ordinary life is then I may not be able to wake up as easily. But if I could, it won't interefere with the creation of my art. And moreover if I could be awake while I create, it could lead to something marvelous because then I would know what to do and what not to do. And how to approach ( ) and how to purify that what should be ( ).

So bring more questions next week. As I say the questions of your life, because we're really very simple about it, you know. Each person has to face the conditions of which he lives. You cannot get away with it. You have to make a living. You have a father and mother. You have realationships. You don't know what to do. Sometimes you miss, sometimes you try. As I said before you burn your fingers. To avoid burning. To avoid destroying too much. To avoid misuse of energy. To become responsible for that what you are as a body and to be able to utilize it for real purposes of life because for that reason, it happens to be given to you. And particularly when you are growing. And the world comes in on you with all the different possibilities and directions in which you want to go and that many things become so tremendously interesting and there is much to much to do and the things that you want to do do not get done because of the variety of interest that you have and there is not enough time and you cannot take it off your sleep because then you don't feel well the next day. But you see, all of that, it is inherent in the person who remains useful and then he has to face this particular problem that he is trying to live. How to select and what to do first. And what to let go and not to feel badly and not to accuse yourself and to utilize the time you have so that at the end of the day you can actually say, I've done my best, to the best of my ability. But perhaps I could do a little better or perhaps I wasn't

right in this and that way. This kind of criticism of course is needed. You must know that it is necessary to criticise yourself. The difficulty always in this form of criticism is that what you consider a fact is not entirely pure. This is real purity that we're now talking about. Because it is not entirely truthful. It is more or less an interpretatinn and many times you're way off, because your idea of that what is an experience or what has become a fact for you, is already interpreted in accordance with preconceived notions of associations. n And with liking and disliking. And if one actually wants to be able to criticize you have to start with something that is truthful, absolute truth. Something on which you can rely and the definition of truth is, there is no arguement. It is the acceptance of everybody for whatever it is as it is without wanting in any sense whatsoever or being able to change it. That is a fact and that becomes absolute fact, and this is what we mean about ourselves. Otherwise you don't even know what to do. How to change yourself. So the first requirement is the accumulation of data about yourself which are truthful.

I've said before. There are two ways by which you receive data about yourself. One is the unconsciuos way of your ordinary life and you keep on thinking and feeling about it and that you call your experience. And that what is in your memory is lodged there simply as a result of that what you have experienced, you remember and the second way is to try as well as you can to have objective data. Data that are pure, absolutely complete and right and again which concern you and belong to you and which might form in you a certain foundation on which you can stand and which can be used as a foundation to continue from. Because you're building on sand when you use your ordinary interpretations of that what is unconsciously certain facts for yourself and you may and you find out that your opinions many times change in the course of years and will and you know it. That you discover certain

facts that you have not seen before or that there are new lights thrown on facts that you thought already were very very conclusive. So you see that's the reason for the absoluteness for yourself. The second reason for the absoluteness is it establishes a language between epople about again there is no areguement because it is not a difficult language. It is a language of objectivity.

But now what does one do? One usually goes goes a little bit ahead without realizing that in a subjective sense ( ) obtain objective facts. And still you don't want to go through the rigamarole of objectivity. And you almost you might say, jump the gun by trying to improve yourself. Whenever you see something that is wrong with you, you will go against it. And for that you must substitute something else which is subjectively also unconscious. And perhaps is a little better as far as ordinary life is concerned. But it will not help you in order to build something because it remains on exactly the same level. So it is not a question of trying to improve yourself. It's first just to have the facts on which you can build a certain criticism that is valid. So one observes. And in that you have facts you accumulate facts. They are truthful. They are lodged in your memory also. Same as any other kind of facts. And then when you are quiet you use your ordinary brain unconsciously thinking about the facts you have and determine if such facts which represent an experience and of course indicated forms of behavior were becoming to that what you call a man, what is foryou as a concept a man who is harmonious.

Of course you're limited in that. Because you don't know what it is. But you try to approximate it and you try to see and this is meant by the objective criticism of facts. What Gurdjieff, what is Beelzebub as a book for us, it is a criticism. But it is not at the time when you are trying to be awake. Because in self observation you're not critical. If you collect facts and if

you use the facts in order to establish a certain modus operandi. That is you wish to continue in a certain directionin which you introduce forms of behavior which I say are more becoming to a man, to you, as you think that you ought to grow up and become more ideal, more real, more again, the word harmonious. This will go against the grain. The introduction of something that is different from your ordinary mechanical behavior. In order to introduce that and to try it, you have to wake up again. Because you cannot do it when you remain asleep. When you remain asleep you start dictating to that what ought to be and even if the dictation is right. And that of what you want to consider the ( ) that could be more harmonious, the way you do it is wrong beca use you do it in a subjective manner and you do it within a thought which really doesn't exist. When you wake up. There is at the time of being awake a posssibility of your mind functioning correctly and objective. And then that what is now the method which you feel or the facts which are more becoming have their place in the objective world which you create. I would almost say for the second time as a means for utilizing the possibility for being awake. Most cases, the first time collecting facts is done by means of so mething that is unspoiled. That is part of your brain. Thatis the purest part. Where it can function in an objective sense. The second time that you wake up, it is the activity of the little 'I' directing that what should take place for a man to undo what is unconsciously not correct, and to substitute what is objectively correct. There is in a nutshell, is Work, and you talked about it last week and you were not entirely clear because you still mix up that what is ordinary life, unconsicous states, subjectively with that what is the function of the little 'I' in a n objective sense. Completely separate and at the same time completely bound. But functioning independent and this impartiality belongs to the little "I'. And in only when 'I' grows that gradually the impartiality

can be assumed or taken over by that what is now an unconscious state. And even your brain, your feeling going over to emotion, your wishes going over into a will of the body. All three centers have changed under the influence of that what is the 'I'. "I" in the beginning is the begining of intellectual body, intellectual octave. Going out to full-growness so that the body has a complete octave up to SI-DO. And then at that time when Kesdjan is also as a body full grown, and the physical body still is in existence. That then there is I've said it before, a certain point, a certain period, a certain possibility in which the three fuze. It is the proper time for fusion between these three. This is real harmony of man. And that that what results is man as a harmonious representing 'I' in which all it's, the physical as well as the emotional have been completely changed into the creation of something that has an entirely new property. And belongs to a different level. The property of that what is being contains within it the ability of each individual body. But the level of the being does not represent any one of the bodies. They have ceased to exist in the fusion and that what then is similar to God.

That is really the aim of 'I'. That is really the aim of fusing for the purpose of man, to pull himself up by his own boot straps to find out what there is, his ( ) achilles heel and to start in a very small way, by the application of certain possibilities for him to develope within himself a dexterity which ultimately will become a guide for him.

You have to read more, you have to think more, you have to talk more. You have to do many more things. You have to be much more alive and when you go home, you sit and think about today at the end of this day and you think and you remember this meeting and you say what did we really talk about? I hope that something stays with you while you're asleep and that tomorrow morning when you wake up, that the first thing you will say, thank

God I am awake and now I want to live really. I want to fulfill my obligations.

See you next week. Goodbye.

Trans: A. Green
Typed: A. Green
Proof: A. Green